| Summary of testimony  | Follow up research proposed by staff  | Research findings  | Staff proposed   | Rationale  | Committee recommendation/result   |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|
|   | Auto avianted us  | es (auto repair, auto specialty, car rental) or  | approach/options   |  |   |
| <ul> <li>Many want to see auto uses remain on<br/>University Avenue and are concerned<br/>about the stigma and added hoops<br/>(relative to city process and lending)<br/>associated with becoming nonconforming<br/>uses</li> <li>Add Auto repair and auto specialty to<br/>TN</li> </ul>  | Map all auto-related non-conforming uses, determine which are also non-conforming as to minimum lot size  | See map  | Bonfe amendment language as suggested by Cmte. For auto repair, auto body and auto specialty. Expansions will need to meet new district design standards. Any use that goes away for 365 days must be reestablished as a conforming use. | Allows existing uses to remain as conforming uses but adds a mechanism to ensure that auto uses are limited going forward.   | Existing auto uses should be permitted to remain without becoming nonconforming. New auto uses should not be permitted. Staff will do Bonfe amendment for Auto repair, body and specialty, and will draft language to permit changing form one auto use to another as long it becomes more conforming. (1/11) |
|   |   |  |  |  |   |
| <ul> <li>Loss of industrially-zoned land is equated with the loss of jobs. Midway Chamber is not resistant to change, but want to ensure that there are job-producing uses in the area now and in the future.</li> <li>Land further than one block from University should remain industrial or no industrially-zoned land should be rezoned.</li> <li>Add a "permissive overlay" to allow for future height and density on industrial land that can be used if needed.</li> <li>Institute a "no net loss" policy.</li> <li>Need clarification of study areas for the CC/TN and West Midway Study.</li> <li>Wait for the results of the West Midway Study before making recommendations regarding industrial land.</li> <li>Need to retain industrial land to remain competitive.</li> <li>Rather than implementing new zoning, extend the overlay for the industrial areas west of Prior until the West Midway Task Force Study is complete.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Determine average job density for selected industrially-zoned blocks by type of development (office, warehouse, manufacturing, retail) from data collected for the West Midway Study.</li> <li>Determine reduction in NCUs if warehousing becomes a permitted use in the IR (industrial restricted) zone (may have been an oversight that this wasn't included when IR was adopted?).</li> </ul> | I land and the questions of whether to wait See job density information and revised map. | Suggested changes to property rezonings, mostly east of Raymond. Removal o Rock Tenn properties from those being rezoned.  | Revised map shows severa properties returning to their previous industrial classification, particularly in the area between the Fairview and Raymond stations where the land use is predominantly industrial and redevelopment will likely take longer to occur. | CPC agreed on map shown at 1/11 mtg along with rezoning area south of University between Fairview & Prior to T3   |

| Number of nonconforming uses created by soning change  Number of nonconforming uses created by soning change  Talk with both larger banks and smaller community banks to determine the fonconforming uses by impact of NCU status on financing.  Number of nonconforming uses to some map changes and smaller community banks to determine the fonconforming uses by financial institutions.  The contact DSI and find out what their contigo compliance letters say about NOU status—is there any explanation in the letter about what that means?  Drive-throughs becoming NCUs restrict the ability of "quick service restaurants" to locate in the corridor and has an impact on the jobs that the restaurant may provide.  Drive-throughs becoming NCUs were the corridor and has an impact on the jobs that the restaurant may provide.  Drive-throughs becoming NCUs were the corridor and has an impact on the jobs that the restaurant may provide.  Drive-throughs becoming NCUs were through the suggested code amendment language will use to be reconstructed if a building permit is pulled within 6 months.  Concern about the loss of legal nonconforming uses status following a period of vacancy, potentially due to foreclosure. City Attorney's Office has made the determination that a property that is actively being marketed for the legal nonconforming uses will not lose it status during that time.  Potential to affect the down payment requirement and financing conditions if the land is valued based on the underlying, more restrictive, pointing appropriation of refinancing to do an expansion or remodel, which would be contingent on Planning Commission approval adding an element of uncertainty and addition of Sonfe amendment language will addition of Sonfe amendment and addition of Sonfe amendment anguag | Summary of testimony   | Follow up research proposed by staff  | Research findings  | Staff proposed approach/options   | Rationale   | Committee recommendation/result   |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|---|
| smaller community banks to determine treatment of nonconforming uses by financial institutions  Most NCUs are on industrial property.  Contact DSI and find out what their zoning compliance letters say about NCUs status — is there any explanation in the letter about what that means?  Trive-throughs becoming NCUs restrict the ability of "quick service restaurants" to locate in the corridor and has an impact on the jobs that the restaurant may provide.  Smaller community banks to determine treatment of nonconforming uses by financial institutions  "General misunderstanding regarding the provisions permitting nonconforming uses on the confirming uses statisting analysis of nonconforming uses studied within 6 months.  Concern about the loss of legal nonconforming uses studing parameted for the legal nonconforming use will not lose it status during that time.  Potential to affect the down payment requirement and financing conditions if the land is valued based on the underlying, more restrictive, zoning.  Regarding expansions and remodelling, this is more of a concern for the business owner. Banks make loans on the original property conditions and assume that those conditions are sufficient to service the debt. There was no discussion of refinancing to do an expansion or remodel, which would be contingent on Planning Commission approval adding an element of uncertainty and additional time.   |  | Numb  | er of nonconforming uses created by zoning   | g change  |   |   |
|  | <ul> <li>Most NCUs are on industrial property.</li> <li>Drive-throughs becoming NCUs restrict the ability of "quick service restaurants" to locate in the corridor and has an impact on the jobs that the</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Talk with both larger banks and smaller community banks to determine impact of NCU status on financing.</li> <li>Contact DSI and find out what their zoning compliance letters say about NCU status – is there any explanation in the letter about what that means?</li> </ul> | Summary of responses regarding the treatment of nonconforming uses by financial institutions  • General misunderstanding regarding the provisions permitting nonconforming uses to be reconstructed if a building permit is pulled within 6 months.  • Concern about the loss of legal nonconforming use status following a period of vacancy, potentially due to foreclosure. City Attorney's Office has made the determination that a property that is actively being marketed for the legal nonconforming use will not lose it status during that time.  • Potential to affect the down payment requirement and financing conditions if the land is valued based on the underlying, more restrictive, zoning.  • Regarding expansions and remodeling, this is more of a concern for the business owner Banks make loans on the original property conditions are sufficient to service the debt. There was no discussion of refinancing to do an expansion or remodel, which would be contingent on Planning Commission approval adding an element of uncertainty and additional time. | Some map changes and addition of Bonfe amendment language will reduce the number of nonconformities - staff will prepare a revised map and resulting analysis of nonconforming uses | nonconformities are<br>drastically reduced by<br>making auto-oriented uses<br>permitted and the | by making most auto uses conforming<br>through the suggested code amendment<br>and selective changes o the zoning map |

| Summary of testimony   | Follow up research proposed by staff  | Research findings   | Staff proposed approach/options   | Rationale | Committee recommendation/result  |
|--|---|---|---|-----------|--|
|  | Variances - given the Krumm   | nenacher decision, consideration of using CL  | JPs as option to vary standards   |           |  |
| <ul> <li>Write more CUPs into the code for<br/>FAR, height, setbacks – Comprehensive<br/>Plan calls for flexibility.</li> </ul>  | Determine status of any initiatives to<br>introduce new legislation in the<br>upcoming session that would clarify rules<br>for approving variances to restore<br>flexibility by cities to grant variances.  |   |   |           | Legislation was introduced on 1/10/11, which, once passed, will make it easier to grant variances.               |
|  |   | dor Initiative to use zoning to create health   | neighborhoods   |           |  |
| Main focuses of study are<br>transportation, housing and a healthy<br>economy.   | related to living wage, targeted vendor, green development, and other compliance requirements that are tied to receipt of City financing.   | TN zones are geared toward promoting a more pedestrian-oriented and accessible land use pattern, which presents more opportunities for people to be active, thus promoting a healthier lifestyle. A fine grain of uses with more attention to the pedestrian scale promotes walkability and increases options, making it easier for people to make healthier choices. | Staff developed a response to show how the proposed zoning recommendations and other on-going City and community initiatives are aligned with the goals of the HCI. |           | Committee agreed with staff document/findings and indicated interest in commenting on the findings from the HIA. |
| <ul> <li>Suggest living wage requirements; fast food bans; big box retail bans; affordable housing replacement policy; healthy food stores, farmers markets, community gardens; small business retail space set aside in larger developments (Phoenix model); bike parking; public restrooms.</li> <li>Do not increase the threshold for general retail CUPs from 10,000 to 15,000 SF</li> </ul> | Summarize current community initiatives underway that are addressing some of the goals and objectives identified by the Health Corridor for All Health Impact Assessment.      Research examples from a sampling of other cities regarding these types of requirements. |   |   |           |  |

| Summary of testimony   | Follow up research proposed by staff | Research findings                         | Staff proposed approach/options  | Rationale   | Committee recommendation/result   |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
|  | Height and                           | d density - Not allowing enough and Allow |  |   |   |
| ■ City is leaving too much development value on the table. ■ Zoning proposal should more accurately reflect the CCDS in terms of development potential. ■ T4 should go back to 150′ in height with a 10-20% density bonus for affordable housing.  Allowing too much ■ T4 shouldn't be used within 500 feet of low-density residential. ■ Use absolute height maximums rather than writing in CUPs/exceptions. ■ Concerns about too much height/density being permitted at the University/Lexington intersection; areas that are T4 should be T3, those that are T3 should be T2 so as not to encroach on the neighborhood. Jobs are important but more jobs can be added without the added density. ■ Taller buildings are more expensive to build and difficult to lease, requirement should be reduced. |                                      |   | Staff is exploring ways to address transitions to lower density neighborhoods, require more attention to the treatment of the alley side of buildings and parking lots to soften the commercial residential edge  Introduce a setback requirement for T districts adjacent to R or RT districts where a T district other than single-family is immediately adjacent or separated by an | Several cities have similar requirements including Portland, OR, Toronto and Tempe, AZ. Stepbacks | Committee is interested in seeing the text changes relative to transitions that staff is developing. Committee is comfortable with the heights proposed in the T districts. |
|  |                                      |   |  |   |   |

| Summary of testimony   | Follow up research proposed by staff   | Research findings                          | Staff proposed approach/options  | Rationale   | Committee recommendation/result  |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|
|  |  | Affordable housing and inclusionary zoning | g  |   |  |
| <ul> <li>New construction should<br/>include affordable housing – MICAH<br/>proposed the 50/50 plan.</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Summarize Saint Paul<br/>affordable housing policies and<br/>record of developing affordable<br/>housing; place in regional<br/>context.</li> </ul> |  | • Staff is compiling some information on affordable housing and how some of the goals presented a the public hearing are being reached now and could be reached in the future. |   |  |
| Inclusionary zoning is a way that limited public resources can go farther and shift some of the responsibility for the creation of affordable units on to the private market. There will be developers in the future who don't need public subsidies and it's fair to expect private investment to further public goals. | <ul> <li>Research and summarize<br/>specific example of Madison, WI<br/>experience.</li> </ul>   |  | *Staff has developed a memo outlining the potential use of density bonuses for public benefits, including affordable housing, for review by the committee.                     |   | Committee members agree that implementing density bonuses is a good way to exchange density for public benefits. Staff proposed doing a study with the help of a consultant. |
| <ul> <li>Added cost of monitoring<br/>affordability and administering<br/>inclusionary zoning requirements.</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Summarize research<br/>completed regarding<br/>inclusionary zoning policies from<br/>around the country.</li> </ul>                                 |  |  |   |  |
|  |  | Gentrification                             |  |   |  |
| Concern about rising property taxes.   | Summarize research about impact of<br>LRT on property values – Hiawatha<br>example and studies from around the<br>country.                                   |  | Consider allowing backyard cottages and attached secondary dwelling units within 1/4 to 1/2 mile of LRT.   | These uses address several issues. First, they provide a potential income source for homeowners close to the LRT offsetting potential property tax increases. Secondly, they can provide a source for affordable rental units. Additionally, they provide additional incentive for coordinated alley maintenance. Finally, they provide a slight increase in density that takes advantage of the LRT. |  |
| <ul> <li>Adjust Area Median Income (AMI)<br/>benchmark for affordable units to 20%<br/>rather than 30%</li> </ul>  |  |  | A reduction in AMI is a matter of public policy and is not appropriately dealt with through zoning.  |   |  |

| Summary of testimony   | Follow up research proposed by staff | Research findings                          | Staff proposed approach/options  | Rationale | Committee recommendation/result  |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|--|-----------|--|
|  | Elimina                              | tion of minimum parking requirements - pro | and con  |           |  |
| pro ■ No minimums are better for businesses. ■ Need to change language to ensure that there is adequate bike parking (currently tied to number of parking spaces provided). ■ Consider implementing an absolute maximum standard, could be the existing requirement in 63.207, parking requirements by use, or provided in a structure.  con ■ Businesses can't afford to operate without parking — need it for customers and deliveries. ■ Eliminating minimum parking requirement as a whole within ¼ mile is more of a concern than just eliminating it within TN zones. ■ Eliminating minimum parking requirement is going too far — suggested |                                      |  | Testimony indicated that the preference was to limit this provision to the TN areas within the station area. |           | Limit the elimination of parking requirements to the TN areas within the station areas.                |
| 50% reduction initially.   |                                      | TDM D                                      |  |           |  |
| Downtown businesses should be  |                                      | TDM Requirements in downtown               |  |           | Committee agreed that the TDM as ation   |
| <ul> <li>Downtown businesses should be exempt from doing TDMs – seen as a barrier for businesses.</li> <li>TDM requirements should remain applicable to downtown businesses.</li> </ul>  |                                      |  |  |           | Committee agreed that the TDM section should remain as is, with TDM requirements applying to downtown. |

| Summary of testimony                                   | Follow up research proposed by staff     | Research findings                           | Staff proposed approach/options | Rationale                  | Committee recommendation/result           |
|--|--|---|---------------------------------|----------------------------|---|
|  |  | Use of shared alleys for commercial traffic |                                 |                            |   |
| <ul> <li>Concerns that residents along</li> </ul>      | Develop summary of existing City         |   | Staff is looking at ways to     |                            | Committee has agreed that as part of      |
| proposed shared alleys haven't received                | policies regarding use, maintenance,     |   | require more                    |                            | their recommendation to the City Council, |
| proper notification. Sharing an alley with             | improvement, and financing of alleys     |   | attention/better treatments     |                            | they will include a letter suggesting     |
| University Ave businesses can lead to a                | and identify issues to resolve if shared |   | to the rear of commercial       |                            | further study of alleys relative to       |
| reduction in residential quality of life and           | commercial-residential alleys are to be  |   | buildings and parking lots      |                            | maintenance and management.               |
| property values; concerns about                        | used more frequently for commercial      |   | that abut a residential alley,  |                            |   |
| maintenance, wear and tear, trash pick                 | vehicle parking and deliveries.          |   | as well as adress transitions   |                            |   |
| up, commercial deliveries, etc.                        |  |   | from commercial to              |                            |   |
|  |  |   | residential uses.               |                            |   |
| <ul> <li>Shared alleys create unsafe</li> </ul>        | Develop map of where there are           |   | Parking and loading areas in    | This uses current standard |   |
| conditions.  | shared alleys along Central Corridor.    |   | T districts along alleyways     | to mitigate impact of      |   |
|  |  |   | shared with R districts shall   | commercial/residential     |   |
|  |  |   | be landscaped along the         | alleyways by treating the  |   |
| <ul> <li>Delicate balance between</li> </ul>           |  |   | alleyway to the same            | alley the same as a        |   |
| accommodating residents and new                        |  |   | standard as parking and         | sidewalk.                  |   |
| development – suggest block by block                   |  |   | loading areas adjoining         |                            |   |
| analysis of alley use and University Ave               |  |   | public streets or sidewalks in  |                            |   |
| curb cuts to avoid potential conflicts.                |  |   | section 63.314.                 |                            |   |
| <ul><li>Use of alleys, with a greater</li></ul>        |  |   |                                 |                            |   |
| emphasis on mitigation and landscape                   |  |   |                                 |                            |   |
| design, results in a more walkable                     |  |   |                                 |                            |   |
| environment due to a reduced need for                  |  |   |                                 |                            |   |
| curb cuts along University.                            |  |   |                                 |                            |   |
| <ul> <li>Permission of additional curb cuts</li> </ul> |  |   |                                 |                            |   |
| will alleviate traffic on side streets and in          |  |   |                                 |                            |   |
| the alleys.  |  |   |                                 |                            |   |
| <ul> <li>Minneapolis cleans and maintains</li> </ul>   |  |   |                                 |                            |   |
| alleys and business districts. To keep                 |  |   |                                 |                            |   |
| businesses in Saint Paul, the city should              |  |   |                                 |                            |   |
| consider providing these services.                     |  |   |                                 |                            |   |
| consider providing these services.                     |  |   |                                 |                            |   |

| Summary of testimony                          | Follow up research proposed by staf | f Research findings | Staff proposed approach/options | Rationale                   | Committee recomn | nendation/result |  |  |
|---|-------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|------------------|--|--|
| Property rezonings                            |                                     |                     |                                 |                             |                  |                  |  |  |
| Address                                       | Owner                               | Existing Zoning     | Request                         | Requestor                   | Proposed Zoning  | CPC Change       |  |  |
| 620 Pelham                                    | SPPA                                | l1                  | Remain I1                       | Lorrie Louder, Neil         | l1               | none             |  |  |
|   |                                     |                     |                                 | Holstein, Tom Vitalik       |                  |                  |  |  |
| 0 Raymond                                     | Rock Tenn                           | l1                  | Remain I1                       | Robert Carpenter            | T4               | I1               |  |  |
| 2220 Myrtle                                   | Rock Tenn                           | 12                  | Remain I2                       | Robert Carpenter            | T3               | 12               |  |  |
| 2256 Myrtle                                   | Rock Tenn                           | 12                  | Remain I2                       | Robert Carpenter            | T3               | 12               |  |  |
| 2265 Wabash                                   | Rock Tenn                           | 12                  | Remain I2                       | Robert Carpenter            | T3               | 12               |  |  |
| 2280 Myrtle                                   | Rock Tenn                           | 12                  | Remain I2                       | Robert Carpenter            | T3               | 12               |  |  |
| 689 Hampden                                   | Rock Tenn                           | 12                  | Remain I2                       | Robert Carpenter            | T3               | 12               |  |  |
| 0 Lexington Pkwy (342923410067)               | Wilder                              | В3                  | T4                              | Wilder                      | T4               | none             |  |  |
| 0 Lexington Pkwy (342923410069)               | Wilder                              | B3                  | T4                              | Wilder                      | T4               | none             |  |  |
| 1441 University                               | Constantino                         | В3                  | В3                              | Tetra & Al Constantino      | T2               | none             |  |  |
| 880 University                                | Latuff                              | В3                  | В3                              | Peter Latuff                | T2               | none             |  |  |
| 2108 University                               | Rihm                                | 12                  | 12                              | Marvin Liszt                | IR               | l1               |  |  |
| 2109 University                               | Rihm                                | l1                  | l1                              | Marvin Liszt                | IR               | l1               |  |  |
| 2120 Charles                                  | Rihm                                | l1                  | l1                              | Marvin Liszt                | IR               | 11               |  |  |
| 740 University                                | Glasgow                             | В3                  | В3                              | John Glasgow                | T2               | none             |  |  |
| 1790 University                               | Hafner                              | В3                  | В3                              | Michael Hafner              | T3               | none             |  |  |
| 1800 University                               | Hafner                              | В3                  | В3                              | Michael Hafner              | T3               | none             |  |  |
| S. side Univ. between Prior and E.            | Varies                              | В3                  | T3                              | Benita Warns, Michael       | T4               | T3               |  |  |
| Lynnhurst                                     |                                     |                     |                                 | Warns                       |                  |                  |  |  |
| Within 100' of Iris Park to the east and      | Varies                              | В3                  | T3 or less intense              | Union Park District Council | T4               | Т3               |  |  |
| west  |                                     |                     |                                 |                             |                  |                  |  |  |
| 620 Pelham                                    | SPPA                                | l1                  | T4                              | Theresa Olsen, John Schatz  | 11               | none             |  |  |
| 1607 University                               | Holden                              | В3                  | В3                              | Tim Holden                  | T4               | none             |  |  |
| E. side of Lexington, south of Fuller to I-94 | Varies                              | B3 and RM2          | Remain B3 & RM2 or rezone       | PBHRC                       | T2               | none             |  |  |
|   |                                     |                     | to T1                           |                             |                  |                  |  |  |
| E. of Lexington between Aurora & Fuller       | Franks Nursery & Crafts             | B3                  | T2                              | PBHRC                       | Т3               | none             |  |  |
| SE corner of Lexington & University           | Varies                              | В3                  | T3                              | PBHRC                       | T4               | T3               |  |  |
| S. side of University between oxford &        | Varies                              | B3/I1/RT1/VP        | T2                              | PBHRC                       | T3               | none             |  |  |
| Chatsworth                                    |                                     |                     |                                 |                             |                  |                  |  |  |
| 2 Southernmost parcels at the SE corner       | Credit Union & Camphor Church       | T2                  | T2                              | PBHRC                       | T3               | T2               |  |  |
| of Dale & University                          |                                     |                     |                                 |                             |                  |                  |  |  |
| SW corner of Mackubin & University            | Varies                              | B3                  | T2                              | PBHRC                       | T3               | none             |  |  |
| Parcels on the south side of University at    | Varies                              | B3/I1               | T2                              | PBHRC                       | T3               | none             |  |  |
| Western                                       |                                     |                     |                                 |                             |                  |                  |  |  |